

Applicant : Jeffrey H. Burns
Appln. No. : 10/679,752
Page : 4

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended and claim 10 has been canceled. Claim 20 has been added. Claims 6, 7 and 11-19 were previously canceled. Therefore, upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 20 will remain pending and under consideration in the above-identified application.

Claim Objection

Claim 8 was objected to because of informalities relating to "Lack of clarity and precision." The Examiner has requested that claim 8 be amended so that it is consistent with paragraph 21 of the specification by reciting that the optical imaging element is electrically coupled to the electrical circuit, rather than the integrated circuit.

Applicants agree with the Examiner and have amended claim 8 as requested, thereby overcoming the objection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al. (United States Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050717).

The rejection has been overcome by amending the claims to require a lens mount supporting a lens coupled to a second surface of the optically transmissive substrate opposite the first surface of the optically transmissive substrate. This feature is neither taught nor suggested by Yamada et al. Rather, Yamada et al. consistently teach for each of the disclosed embodiments, that lens unit 3 is coupled to a surface of stepped wiring board 21, rather than to filter element 24 (alleged substrate).

The Examiner has admitted that Yamada et al. do not explicitly teach that the lens mount is coupled to a second surface of filter element 24 (alleged substrate). However, the Examiner has taken the position that Melman et al. teach a lens mount coupled to a surface of a substrate via body 300 opposite a second surface on which an optical imaging element 116 is mounted. It has been concluded in the Office Action that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to couple the lens mount taught

Applicant : Jeffrey H. Burns
Appln. No. : 10/679,752
Page : 5

by Yamada et al. to a second surface of the substrate as taught by Melman, for the benefit of ensuring the correct positioning of the imaging device along its optical axis.”

It is respectfully submitted that the conclusion is incorrect because Melman et al. teach film leads 302 and 304 in contact with leading edges 108 and 110 of cover 106 to ensure correct positioning of imaging device 100 along the optical axis 308 (see column 4, lines 50-52 of Melman ‘393), whereas filter element 24 (alleged substrate) does not have the required leading edges nor a camera body with film leads to motivate such modification. Moreover, Yamada et al. provide positioning pins 23 “for positioning the lens unit 3 on the stepped wiring board 21.” See paragraph 41 of Yamada et al. It is respectfully submitted that the person of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate the superior positioning properties of pins 23 and would not be motivated or have any reason to add a camera body 300 having film leads 302 and 304 and modifying lens member 24 to have leading edges engaged by the film leads as taught by Melman et al. Such modification is contrary to the teachings of Yamada et al. and would not be expected to provide any benefit or improvement, such that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not find the proposed combination of Yamada et al. in view of Melman et al. obvious.

Support for the amendment may be found, among other places, in original claim 10, which has been canceled.

Because Yamada et al. do not teach, suggest, or provide any reason for coupling lens unit 3 to filter element 24, rather than to wiring board 21 (or 5), Yamada et al. neither anticipate nor make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, all rejections based on the Yamada et al reference should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. in view of Melman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,018).

It is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-5 are allowable for the reasons generally set forth above with respect to independent claim 1. More specifically, neither Yamada et al. nor Melman et al. ‘018 teach, suggest or provide any reason for coupling a lens

Applicant : Jeffrey H. Burns
Appln. No. : 10/679,752
Page : 6

mount supporting a lens to a second surface of an optically transmissive substrate opposite a first surface of the optically transmissive substrate on which an electrical circuit is coupled.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. in view of Melman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,393).

This rejection has been obviated by cancellation of claim 10.

New Claim

Claims 20 has been added to claim subject matter supported by the original specification but not previously claimed. Support for claim 20 can be found, among other places, at paragraph 24 (page 6, lines 3-4), which states that "Optically transmissive medium 32 may be provided between integrated circuit 16 and optical transmissive substrate 12."

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, is it respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and notice of the same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

January 10, 2008

Date

/Gunther J. Evanina/

Gunther J. Evanina, Registration No. 35 502
Price, Heneveld, Cooper, DeWitt & Litton, LLP
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

GJE/dac